

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 6, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-12, 16, 17, 20-27 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hegli. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the different processing between registered users and temporary users. Specifically, claim 1 recites "said access control mechanism providing full access to the registered user and providing temporary access information based on visitor information for a temporary user." This aspect is illustrated, for example, in Applicant's Figure 4, where a registered user is provided with normal login at step 106 but a temporary user is subject to access limits. This allows temporary users to access sites, but with certain restrictions.

Hegli fails to teach or suggest differing treatment for registered users or temporary users. In Hegli, users have restricted categories, but there is no distinction between registered users and temporary users. Thus, Hegli fails to teach the features of claim 1 or suggest a solution to the problem addressed by claim 1.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Hegli. Claims 3-11 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Hegli for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Claims 12, 16, 17, 20-27 and 30-31 recite features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over Hegli for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2, 13-15, 18, 19, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hegli in view of Heinz. Heinz was relied upon for teaching password generation and emailing the password to a user. Heinz, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Hegli discussed above. Thus, claims 2, 13-15, 18, 19, 28 and 29 are patentable over Hegli in view of Heinz.

For all the reasons advanced above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of

the claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is cordially requested to telephone, if the Examiner believes that it would be advantageous to the disposition of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment, which may be required for this amendment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1130. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in any petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

Date: July 28, 2004